REMARKS

I SPECIFICATION

The Examiner has objected to the title of the invention as not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title of the invention.

II REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, 12 and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Brodie et al.* (U. S. Patent No. 5,063,327).

As the Examiner is well aware, for a claim to be anticipated under § 102, each and every element of the claim must be found within the cited prior art reference.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2. As a result, the rejections of claims 1 and 4-6 are moot.

Claim 8 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 11. As a result, the rejections of claim 8-10, 12 and 14 are moot.

Claim 15 has been amended so that it recites a grid electrode having a plurality of individually controllable grid portions, each for controlling emissions of electrons from a single pixel of the cathode. *Brodie* does not disclose such a limitation. Each of the grid portions asserted by the Examiner as electrodes 44, 46, and 47 comprise strips that actually control emissions of electrons from more than one pixel of the cathode. This is disclosed in *Brodie* in column 4, lines 25-38 where it states that the bases and gates of a selected row of pixels will be simultaneously energized to produce electrons to provide the desired pixel display, and an entire row of pixels is simultaneously energized, rather than individual pixels being energized alone in a raster scan manner. As a result, *Brodie* teaches away from claim 15.

Claims 1-3, 8 and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Akama* (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,092). Again, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As stated above, claims 1 and 8 have both been amended to include limitations that state that the grid portions are electrically isolated from each other, and that the control circuitry independently causes an emission of electrons from the field emitter from the electron emission material at each pixel site. In *Akama*, the plurality of grid portions are not each electrically isolated from each other as can be seen in Fig. 43 where, for example, pixel sites 101 along any column are activated using the same grid electrode 107. Thus, the pixel sites are actually electrically connected to each other and not electrically isolated from each other. As a result, *Akama* does not anticipate claims 1 and 8.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Brodie* in view of *Fahlen et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,589,731). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Since claim 13 depends from claim 8, which is allowable over *Brodie*, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 13 is patentable.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the above rejections, claim 7 has not been rejected by any prior art. As a result, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

By: _____
Kelly K. Kordzik
Reg. No. 36,571

5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, Texas 75270-2199
(512) 370-2851

AUSTIN_1\227778\1
12179-P092US 09/15/2003